# THE REMONSTRANCE

# AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

# **BOSTON, JANUARY, 1920**

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, West Virginia, Texas, Florida, North Carolina, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Transvers.

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other Publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts

One hundred and fifty-eight Branch Committees; 41,635\*
members in 443 cities, towns, and villages

MRS. RANDOLPH FROTHINGHAM, President MRS. JOHN BALCH WRS. A. H. PARKER MRS. JAMES D. COLT Presidents

MRS. JAMES D. COLT

MRS. GEORGE R. AGASSIZ

MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD

MRS. CURTIS GUILD

MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL

MRS. ROBERT S. RUSSELL

MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer

Walaut Street, Brocklin

Education and Organization Committee
Chairman
MISS M. LOUISE BROWN

Montenio Committee
Chairman
MISS JULIA C. PRENDERGAST

Legislatice Committee
Chairman
MRS. HENRY PRESTON WHITE

Public Interests Longue Provident MRS. B. L. ROBINSON

College Anti-Sufrage League Provident MRS. HERBERT LYMAN

Recording Secretary MRS. FRANK FOXCROFT

Corresponding Secretary MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG

Not present membership of women over 21 years of age; aliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State

MEMBERS ARE EARNESTLY RE-QUESTED TO KEEP HEADQUARTERS ADVISED OF CHANGES OF ADDRESS.

#### TOO GREAT A RISK

A good many men who have been counting themselves as suffragists, and have been in the habit of saying, with easy good nature, when the subject was broached, "Certainly, if the women want to vote, let them," are taking the question more seriously nowadays.

For one thing, they have discovered that the majority of women not only do not want to vote, but will not vote when the opportunity is offered. In New York city this year, considerably less than one half of the women qualified to register took the trouble to do so. The number registering was more than 50,000 fewer than last year, and the total registering was almost exactly one half the total of the men.

But the most staggering consideration in the minds of thoughtful and intelligent men is the risk involved in putting the ballot in the hands of a wholly untrained and impulsive electorate. The problems confronting this country at the present moment are the most complex and difficult which it has ever been called upon to face. The war emergency was a great strain; but in meeting it, the country was substantially united; in the after-war problems, the institutions of the nation are assailed. Strike follows strike; employers and workers drift hopelessly apart; abnormal conditions of cost and production constitute a menace to all classes in the community; and a deliberate, wellorganized and well-financed propaganda of lawlessness and violence, having for its object the overthrow of the Government, the confiscation of property, and the seizure of industries, is making alarming headway, especially among our alien population. To deal with these

problems, to repel these menaces, is a task which calls for judgment, experience and resolution. Are these qualities likely to be found in an untrained electorate, unfamiliar with public affairs and only moderately interested in them? And is it not a good deal of a risk to give the ballot to the great mass of Socialist-Communist women, who are ready to follow the reckless Bolshevik leadership to any extremes?

These are sobering questions for any man to consider who, thinking only of the women of his acquaintance, and reluctant not to gratify wishes which he imagines that they entertain, has not taken into account the broader aspects of the question, nor stopped to consider that the ballot, if given to women, is not given only to the intelligent, the right-minded, the well-meaning, but to all women, on the same basis as to all men, and that it will recruit the forces of lawlessness, disorder and Bolshevism, and will make more difficult the urgent task of dealing effectively with them. These considerations should impel every reasonable man to wish to defer so revolutionary and irrevocable a change as federal woman suffrage involves, at least until the nation has had time to deal intelligently with the grave questions of social, economic and industrial reconstruction which have followed in the wake of the war.

THERE were eight women candidates for the New York Assembly at the November election; but only two were elected. The Assembly consists of 150 members. Somehow, the ratio of 2 to 148 does not suggest an overwhelming enthusiasm for the alleged "elevating influence" of women in legislation.

# THE ANTI-RATIFICATION LUNCHEON

There was a large attendance at the Copley-Plaza on the 21st of October, at the National Anti-Ratification Luncheon. The guest of honor was Miss Mary G. Kilbreth, the National President; and her address — the substance of which is given elsewhere - was an illuminating and encouraging presentation of the present aspects of the anti-suffrage campaign. Her insistence that the prime object of the campaign was not the "obstructing" of the ratification of the Federal Amendment, but killing it through the passing of duly-certified resolutions of rejection in 13 Legislatures, was warmly received, and generally accepted as the only satisfactory policy.

Among the other guests from outside of the State were Mrs. Roland G. Hazard, the Rhode Island State President; Miss Elizabeth McKeen, President of the Maine Association; Miss Alice D. W. White, Campaign Manager for Maine; and Mrs. Frank S. Streeter, of the New Hampshire

**Executive Committee.** 

In the absence of Mrs. Randolph Frothingham, the President, who was detained by illness, Mrs. John Balch, Vice-President, presided. Frothingham's report was read by Mrs. Frank Foxcroft, Secretary. It concluded with the following:

"Personally, I am stronger than ever against women in politics, and I still believe the thinking men of the country will hold back against the danger of giving increased political power to the machine of socialist, feminist and pro-German women who are at the head of the Suffrage Party in the United States. The average suffragist, like the average antisuffragist, will not go into politics; in fact, many hardly know the names of the leaders of the Suffrage Party.

The greatest menace of the world today is Bolshevism, and every American woman should do her utmost to check its progress. The position of the anti-suffragists is a strong one; not one of our leaders has ever preached revolution or defiance of law. We have always stood for law

and order, and can be called upon by the Government for help in any and all emergencies. Our State organization should be kept up, as we can still help the other States with propaganda, statistics and personal influence, and always money, which is so greatly needed.

Let us stand united to support our

country in her hour of need.

The absence of Mrs. Frothingham gave Mrs. Foxcroft an opportunity to pay a glowing tribute to the courage, self-sacrifice and devotion which she had shown during the strain of the arduous and unanticipated campaign of the summer. Mrs. Foxcroft declared that she had never seen in her life more beautiful courage, a more serene spirit, or a more cordial appreciation of others' help than were shown by Mrs. Frothingham. Yet the strenuous character of the campaign, and its peculiarly difficult conditions — indeed, that there was going to be any campaign at all - could not have been foreseen when Mrs. Frothingham assumed the responsibilities of the Presidency; but she met the emergency unflinchingly. At the conclusion of Mrs. Foxcroft's remarks, Miss Evelyn Sears moved a rising vote of thanks to Mrs. Frothingham for her splendid work, and the motion was unanimously adopted.

Miss Elizabeth McKeen, President of the Maine Association, gave an interesting account of the successful efforts of that Association in securing signatures for a referendum on the Presidential Suffrage bill. In the absence of Miss Clara Vezin, President of the New Jersey Association, Mrs. Henry Preston White read Miss Vezin's report of the struggle in that State — on the part of the suffragists to secure ratification, and on the part of the anti-suffragists to have the Federal amendment submitted to a referendum.

Mrs. Benjamin L. Robinson, President of the Public Interests League, spoke earnestly of the alarming spread of Bolshevism in this country. America, she said, has for the last few years conducted itself like of "self-determination."

a nation of ostriches: everybody has kept his head well in the sand. We have been receiving Bolshevik agitators, bringing with them huge sums of money. They have gone over the country among the working classes. Our colleges have been harboring Bolshevik instructors, who have spread their influence among the younger generation. Radcliffe has been one of the worst, and Wellesley another; and it is more serious in a way to have the girls' colleges filled with this spirit, because the girls go out from college to teach in the public schools; and every recruit to the Bolshevik platform is imbued with the idea that she must teach it wherever she goes. Mrs. Robinson quoted from the morning paper an account of a meeting of Boston Communists, which demanded the overthrow of the United States Government; from a speech by Senator Watson, which described the Chicago offices of the Trade Commission as a centre of sedition and anarchy; and from the list of the National Advisory Council of the National Woman's Party, to show how many of its members are active Socialists.

Miss Kilbreth was called upon again for a further explanation of the campaign for rejection, which was received with prolonged applause; and the adjournment of the meeting was followed by an informal reception to Miss Kilbreth.

#### NO PEERESSES FOR THEM

The British House of Commons, on the 27th of October, adopted an amendment to the pending bill for the removal of sex disqualifications, permitting women to sit and vote in the House of Lords. But the House of Lords, on the 11th of November, rejected the amendment, apparently preferring to decide for itself the qualifications for membership in its own branch of Parliament. This is the latest instance

#### A GRAVE DANGER AHEAD

(Editorial in The Boston Herald, Dec. 10)

Up to the present moment, the Federal Suffrage amendment is fifteen states short of the thirty-six whose ratification, by legislative action, is necessary to make the amendment effective in the presidential election of 1920. As it is extremely doubtful whether these fifteen additional ratifications can be secured in season, it is time, as the Herald suggested some time ago, that the political leaders of both parties should begin to consider what would happen if women should undertake to vote in certain states whose legislatures have enacted presidential suffrage bills, in spite of restrictions of the suffrage to male voters in the state constitutions.

There are twelve states in which the claim of women to vote rests upon presidential suffrage bills. In all of them, it may be assumed, women will vote for President next November and state officials, unless checked by court process, may be counted on to permit it. But what then?

One of these states is Wisconsin, the constitution of which describes as qualified electors "every male person of the age of 21 years and upwards" belonging to either of three specified classes, and adds: "The Legislature may at any time extend by law the right of suffrage to persons not herein enumerated, but no such law shall be in force until the same shall have been submitted to a vote at a general election and approved by a majority of all votes cast at such election." The Wisconsin presidential suffrage law was never so submitted and approved. Now, suppose that the national result of the 1920 election should turn upon the thirteen electoral votes of Wisconsin, is it likely that the political party whose candidates would be defeated if those votes were counted would accept the result without a protracted contest like that of 1876?

Another presidential suffrage state is North Dakota. The constitution of that state defines qualified electors as "every male person of the age of 21 years or upwards," and says: "No law extending or restricting the right of suffrage shall be in force until adopted by a majority of the electors of the state voting at a general election." No such vote has been taken. Now, suppose that North Dakota women vote for Presi-

dent next November, and suppose that the result of the presidential election turns upon that state's five electoral votes. What then?

electoral votes. What then?

Minnesota is another state in which women have been given presidential suffrage by act of Legislature, without reference to the people. But article 7 of the Minnesota constitution in its first section provides that "every male person of 21 years or upwards" shall, under certain conditions, be entitled to vote "for all offices that now are, or hereafter may be, elective by the people"; and, in the second section, says: "No person not belonging to one of the classes specified in the preceding section shall be entitled or permitted to vote at any election."

The last presidential election was carried for President Wilson by a plurality of only twenty-three electoral votes. The transfer of twelve electors from the Democratic to the Republican column would have elected Mr. Hughes. The whole election result might have pivoted—though it did not—upon the twelve electoral votes of Minnesota; and those electoral votes were carried by a plurality at the polls of only three hundred and ninety-two.

There are a dozen presidential suffrage states whose votes will be open to contest next year; and in half of them, at least, the ground of contest is as plain as in the states just cited. In the aggregate, it is a formidable total of electoral votes which may be contested. It would be the height of folly to drift along unthinking toward such an issue. Suffragists as well as anti-suffragists should wish to have the validity of presidential suffrage tested before the election, rather than have it made the subject of protracted and dangerous controversy afterward.

# AN AMENDMENT THAT IS NEEDED

Senator Frelinghuysen of New Jersey introduced in the Senate, on the 13th of November, a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution, requiring the ratification of constitutional amendments by popular vote.

Congress cannot too soon submit the amendment which Senator Frelinghuysen proposes. The existing system is alien to all our theories and

principles of government. We boast that we have a government which is "of the people, by the people, and for the people"; yet, in the vital matter of changes in the fundamental law, we shut the people out from any participation in the process. As has just been witnessed in the matter of the proposed suffrage amendment, it is possible for any determined and not over-scrupulous group, by threats and promises, to bring such pressure to bear upon individual members of the House and Senate that they will vote to submit a proposed amendment to the States; and then, by a repetition of the same sort of process, upon the individual members of Legislatures, to secure their votes for ratification — the opinions of the people, meanwhile, being at no point consulted.' By this process, the people, in Massachusetts for example, were not merely ignored, but overridden; for whereas, at the election in 1915, after an active and open campaign, they rejected woman suffrage by a two to one majority, the Legislature of 1919 did not hesitate to ratify the federal amendment by large majorities in both branches, - the chairmen of both political parties being present to check up the votes — and deliberately turned down all proposals for a popular referendum.

The suffrage leaders, it will be remembered, boasted that, by resorting to a federal amendment instead of to State action, they could escape the "humiliation" of appealing to the people, and they did so; but it is hardly conceivable that the founders of our Government realized that the time would ever come when an appeal to the people would be considered an humiliation, and avoided if possible.

It is certainly true that, if the Frelinghuysen amendment could be pushed through Congress and approved by a sufficient number of Legislatures, we should have a system vastly more in accord with popular government than that now prevailing.

NOT OBSTRUCTION, BUT RE-JECTION THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE AIM.

ENCOURAGING PROSPECTS IN A NUMBER OF STATES

AN ACTIVE CAMPAIGN
TO SECURE THIRTEEN DEFINITE REJECTIONS AND SO
TO KILL THE FEDERAL
AMENDMENT

ADDRESS BY MISS MARY G. KILBRETH, PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE, AT THE MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-RATIFICATION LUNCHEON.

We are not obstructing the Federal amendment: we are out to kill the amendment, not to obstruct it. I want to make that very clear. There is a feeling that a Federal amendment cannot be killed, so long as it is pending. We have taken the position that if 13 rejections are secured before 36 ratifications, it is defeated and will have to go through Congress again. Previously, there has been an effort made to obstruct amendments and keep them from being ratified. That is not what we are doing. We are out in a race with the suffragists, to get 13 rejections before the suffragists can get 36 ratifications.

#### What Happened in Georgia

You know how Georgia slipped up. Rejection means concurrent resolutions in both houses of the Legislature, duly signed by the Governor or the Secretary of State, and lodged in Washington. If all that formula is not gone through, that is not a rejection. In Georgia, as you know, the Amendment was tremendously defeated in both houses; but, on account of some slight technicality not provided against — which we believe was the work of suffragists — the Governor refused to sign the resolution when presented to him. And, consequently, Georgia, although it defeated the amendment overwhelmingly, is not registered technically as having rejected it. The Legislature convenes again in Georgia very shortly, and the amendment will then be put through properly and rejected.

## To Be Killed Forever

We want this tested out in the Supreme Court. We want it killed under the dome of the Capitol where the pernicious thing started, so that it can never be started again. We do not want to be in a perpetual state of nerves about it every time there are enough corruptible men in Congress to put this through again.

Senator Borah, who is the greatest defender of the States' rights principle in the Congress of the United States, is one of those most interested in this matter. Mr. Borah. when he voted against the Federal suffrage amendment because it overrides State rights, was charged with inconsistency because he had voted for the Prohibition amendment. And he said: "I voted for the Prohibition amendment, although I am a great supporter of States' rights, simply because you cannot have Prohibition otherwise. In our State, we are in favor of Prohibition, but we cannot have it on account of the Interstate Commerce laws. We cannot keep liquor out because of the laws regulating Interstate Commerce. But, as to woman suffrage, there is absolutely no reason why a State having woman suffrage and another not having it should not get along side by side." That is one of the reasons that we have a stronger case than the liquor people; because the suffrage is the most sacred right of the States, and that is being violated.

I have seen a leading lawyer who was formerly a member of the Cabinet; and he is looking for a decision from the United States Supreme Court which will establish the point that the United States

has no legal voters whatever; but that voting is purely a State matter.

#### The Record of Alabama

Alabama, you know, is the State which has done most brilliantly on this question, in the South. This subject is at a boiling heat down there; and a politician, they say, is absolutely dead if he does anything to further the Federal Suffrage Amendment, or sympathizes with it. The curious part of it is that, although the women have been active in opposing the amendment, the men have been more so. Big business men and lawyers absolutely closed their offices, and went out to work with the women on this matter. One of the foremost lawyers in the State notified me recently: "I am prepared to go now through the South and speak for you"this without any compensation. Judge Evans of Alabama has worked very hard on this subject. He has the theory that it is absolutely illegal to have a question which affects the Constitution of the State decided by the Legislature: for the reason that only the people can change the Constitution. His idea is that it is illegal for the Legislature to impose this change; and he wants to have the legislators impeached who voted for this thing, because they were untrue to their oath of office to observe the Constitution of the United States. Other prominent lawyers in the State have been consulted, and they replied that they thought it a capital idea, and perfectly feasible. It would delight me to see some of the men in these Legislatures impeached.

#### Organizing Against Suffrage

Texas is determined to rescind. That is a question which can only be decided by the Supreme Court. Don't let any lawyer tell you that the thing cannot be rescinded. Texas is strong. The men are organized; and every candidate at the next election will have to sub-

mit to a questionnaire. These men say, "We shall meet you all at Philippi " — meaning the polls —and they have a tremendous men's organization there in Texas. In Arkansas, they are forming organizations of men which are very strong. Probably the strongest organization of men is the League for State Defence in Baltimore. That was started by two prominent lawyers, and other influential men have interested themselves in it. The leaders are now going into other States, and getting similar organizations under way. In Alabama, a very strong worker has appeared on the scene, in the person of Mrs. Pinkard. She is going to go through the Southern States, and she will be the President of the Southern Anti-Ratification League. She will go through the Southern States that have not yet ratified; and she will take with her Mrs. Owen of Baltimore — formerly a suffrage leader — and also the wife of Senator Bankhead, who has now become a very strong anti-suffragist. She has given her entire time to this work. We have down in the South a man whose name is Martin Lee Calhoun, — a name to conjure with in those States. He goes about among the Southern States, and works without salary. There is also a man's organization, the Anti-Ratification League, in Alabama, which is very powerful; and one in Texas, headed by R. L. Henry.

The Western States have shown a great indifference about ratifying this thing. Wisconsin has a strong anti-suffrage organization; and Nebraska is taking up the work rapidly, and expects to be able to find some loophole to make trouble. One of the other States will contest woman suffrage the moment the first woman vote is cast, through an injunction. The Governor of Connecticut has come out strong; and Connecticut has been magnificent. In New York, the suffragists are having a very hard time.

The reason that there is that general feeling that the Federal amendment is pendent until it is ratified is because heretofore there has been simply an effort to keep an amendment from being ratified. Now we want to kill it. We shall, if we get 13 rejections.

# AS TO RESCINDING

Writing in The New York Times of October 12, Ida Husted Harper undertook to prove that it was impossible to prevent the ratification of the proposed Federal Suffrage Amendment, and that it must be before the Legislatures continuously until two-thirds of them ratify it. She pointed to the fact that New Jersey and Ohio ratified the Fourteenth Amendment, and afterward rescinded ratification; but their votes were needed for the ratification, and the Secretary of State counted them, declared the amendment ratified, and then put the case before Congress, which declared the ratification valid. Mrs. Harper quotes Ames, in his "History of Constitutional Amendments," as commenting on these precedents thus:

"From the above it seems clear that, a State having once given its consent, the question is closed and it cannot recall its action; but on the other hand, a State that has rejected an amendment can reconsider its action at any time previous to the incorporation of the amendment into the Constitution."

Mrs. Harper accordingly reaches the conclusion that "Just as surely as the sun will rise tomorrow morning, the Secretary of State of the United States will eventually declare the Nineteenth Amendment a part of the National Constitution," and she asks: "In view of the situation, what do the opponents hope to gain by merely preventing women from voting at this one general election?"

In citing these precedents, and reaching this conclusion, Mrs. Harper overlooks, wilfully or otherwise, one very important fact, namely, that, at the time when the Fourteenth Amendment was before the Legislatures, the principle of the referendum had not been embedded in any State Under the referen-Constitution. dum, where it exists, action by a State Legislature, which seemed final, published her confident assertion that | jority of the women voters.

favorable action by a State Legislature on a proposed amendment was irrevocable, the Supreme Court of Ohio — as is stated in another paragraph in THE REMONSTRANCE—sustained the decision of a lower court, refusing to enjoin the Secretary of State from putting on the ballot a referendum on the question of ratifying the Federal Suffrage Amendment. The Ohio Legislature, under strong suffrage pressure, had hustled the amendment through to ratification, within a few days after it was submitted by Congress; but the attempt of the suffragists to prevent its going to the people, under the referendum, failed miserably — the lower and the highest court concurring in refusing an injunction.

#### CHICAGO CRIME CONDITIONS APPALLING

Addressing the Chicago Association of Commerce on the 5th of November, Edwin W. Sims, President of the Chicago Crime Commission and former United States District Attorney, declared that Chicago, with its population of 3,000,000, has more murders in a year than England, Scotland and Wales. Last year, he said, the murders in Chicago averaged one a day. He added:

"Crime in this city is as highly organized as a mail order business. There is not a Police Captain in the city today who, backed by the prosecuting authorities and the courts, cannot reduce crime in his precinct 50 per cent. in thirty days, if he wants to. Crime conditions in Chicago are appalling.'

These, it must be remembered, are not the words of a casual and superficial observer, but the utterance of a close investigator, and former prosecuting officer, addressed to an assembly of Chicago business men. They tell of present-day conditions in a city which has had for half a dozen years the "uplifting" influence of women's vote, and where the may be overthrown and reversed. existing disgraceful city government Barely a month after Mrs. Harper | commanded the support of a ma-

## WOMEN COMMUNISTS AT WORK

An active propaganda for the overthrow of the American Government, and the establishment of a soviet government after the Russian pattern, is in progress in Massachusetts, and women, communists are taking part in it.

On the evening of October 19, a meeting was held in the New International Hall, Roxbury, under the auspices of the Communist Party, and Mrs. Marion E. Sproul, state secretary of the party in Massachusetts, was the chief speaker. It was reported that the state organizers had established locals in a score of cities and towns - Haverhill, Springfield, Holyoke, Lawrence, Chelsea, Worcester, Peabody, Lowell, Quincy, Pittsfield, North Adams, Greenfield, Lynn, Athol, etc., — during the preceding month, and it was declared that the time for "action" was drawing near. "We are the ones who will have to do the blood-letting," said one speaker. "Might is right; we will take the power into our own hands," was another announcement.

In the course of Mrs. Sproul's impassioned speech, she said:

"We should have a party and revolutionary mass action. We are affiliated with the Third International. We must organize industrially in one big union. We cannot compromise on any point whatever. We have the spirit of rebellion. This is the party of the revolutionary spirit. It was born in Chicago, September 1, when the Communist Party came into existence. The American Federation of Labor is no longer a friend of the working class. The Socialist party has outlived its usefulness.

"We are going to take all there is and control it, and have it for ourselves. We will carry no driftwood. When the day comes, I am going to take what belongs to me — not going to demand it, but take it."

Few Americans realize how freely such doctrines of violence and revolution are being proclaimed in this country nowadays. Fewer still, probably, realize how active a part Communist women of the type of Mrs. Sproul are taking in the agita-

Yet these are among the women whom it is proposed to "enfranchise." They are Suffragists first, then Socialists, then Anarchists.

#### TIRED OF WOMAN BOSSES

One of the consequences of woman suffrage is the development of the woman "boss." She is so strenuous and arbitrary, so insistent upon having other woman voters follow her lead and do exactly what she directs, that she makes life a burden to those who come within her influence. A woman office worker of New York, Miss H. Morse, writing in The New York Times of November 2, expresses her views energetically upon this aspect of woman suffrage:

"We women who worked so hard for woman suffrage have got so much more than we expected or wanted that we are becoming antis. We've got women bosses now; they are everywhere all the time, it seems to us, and we have to keep wide awake and on the watch to see that they don't take away all our liberties. We won't stand for that, and so we are getting so weary of our New York women politicians that we haven't even a desire to vote any more. We are beginning to think the antis were right; they could see further than we; they knew women — at least women who had nothing to do — and they knew what would happen.

We women have worked many years, and have been able to run our own affairs, thank you, to our satisfaction, and to our employers', too, without the aid of lady politicians.

These ladies of leisure seem to think we are their servants; and they are attempting to run us and our affairs just as through the years that are past they tried to run their servants (but could not). The servants struck, and now they are concentrating upon the office workers, and trying to run us. Well, we will strike, too — not against our employers, as these women are urging us to do, but against these women bosses who are trying to get bills passed whereby they will have the power to boss us still more. . . .

Give us men to speak for us. They're intelligent, they take long views of things, they don't have fads and fancies, and they aren't all the time

talking, talking, talking about uplifting us, and doing us good, and pretending to know better what we want and need than we who are on the job."

There is an unmistakable sincerity about this protest; and there is no doubt that it voices the sentiments of thousands of New York women who find themselves dictated to by "ladies of leisure" who have so few real duties pressing upon them that they are quite ready to oversee and direct the political affiliations and activities of women to whom life is a more serious matter. This is only the second year in which women have been voting in New York, but that is ample time to allow of the development of the "woman boss," and it is not surprising that the women whom she seeks to boss find her obnoxious.

#### WOMAN'S "THRALDOM"

In her address at the opening of the National Council of Women at St. Louis on the 11th of November, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt declared ecstatically that the end of the suffrage struggle was in sight, and said:

"The leaders of the suffrage association were the only women, apparently, possessed of the vision of the final liberation of women from the thraldom in which custom, law, and public opinion bound them."

The great majority of American women have not been conscious of any "thraldom." They have led happy and useful lives. They have been beloved by husbands and children. They have been respected; deferred to, and treated with special courtesy and consideration. They have done splendid service in every field of social and philanthropic activity. They have not craved what Mrs. Catt describes as "liberation" because they were not conscious of any form of slavery. As for "vision," their vision has been more clear and true, more unselfish, and more mindful of the best interests of society than that of the typical suffrage leaders.

# A WAIL FROM THE WOMAN'S PARTY

Returning to Washington on the 7th of November, after a threemonths' campaign on the western coast, devoted to coercing or trying to coerce the governors to call extra sessions of their Legislatures, Mrs. Abby Scott Baker, political chairman of the National Woman's Party, made a gloomy report of the prospects of the Federal Amendment. "Unless the Governors of certain of these states can be 'forced' to call extra sessions," she said, "the women of the country will not be able to vote for President in the election of 1920." She spoke with bitterness of the reasons which influenced the recalcitrant Governors:

"There is only one explanation of the refusals of Governors of suffrage states to call ratification sessions. They are not interested in the enfranchisement of women who cannot vote for them personally. The petty local issues of their states are more important to them than is this great issue of national justice. It is said in Oregon that Gov. Olcott, who, as secretary of state, was appointed to take the place of the executive who died, fears his own removal should the Legislature meet. In Wisconsin and various other states of the northwest, the Governors fear the question of soldiers' allotments and land distribution. The Japanese peril is here and there used as a camouflage for these real issues."

At the time that she made this depressing report, nineteen states had ratified the amendment; a special session of the Legislature of North Dakota was scheduled for the 25th of November, and special sessions were promised, though no dates had been set, in Colorado, Idaho and South Dakota. If the promised special sessions were all held, and all resulted in ratification, the roll of suffrage states would be 23, or 13 short of the necessary number.

There are nine Legislatures that meet in regular session in 1920 -Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Mississippi, Rhode Island, New Jersey, South Carolina, Louisiana and

Georgia. If the suffragists could carry all of these, they would still be four short. But what chance have they in Maryland, where both political parties declared against the amendment; or Virginia, where the House of Delegates voted against it, 62 to 21; or Georgia, where both branches of the Legislature have already voted for rejection; or Kentucky; or Mississippi; or South Carolina; or Louisiana?

Mrs. Baker is certainly justified in her gloomy view of suffrage prospects. But, when deploring the recalcitrancy of the Governors of suffrage states, and searching for reasons for it, she might well seek an explanation of the apathy of the women voters in those states. If the women of those states reckon the ballot as a boon, and rejoice in its possession, would they not be enthusiastic over any chance to further the extension of the blessing to the women of other states? Would they not do all the coercing necessary to induce their Governors to call special sessions, and thereby make Mrs. Baker's three months' campaign in their states superfluous? This apathy of the women in the suffrage states is quite as significant as the recalcitrancy of the Governors, and, indeed, goes far to explain

# THE OUTLOOK IN NEW JERSEY

Although New Jersey, at the November election, chose for Governor the Democratic candidate, who had for his platform two planks, one favoring early ratification of the suffrage amendment, and the other declaring his purpose to make the state as "wet" as the Atlantic ocean, the general result was not favorable to woman suffrage. The New York Tribune of November 9 stated that ratification of the woman suffrage amendment by the Legislature just chosen "appears to be imponement of action on suffrage until | States rejecting the amendment.

the people had decided the issue at a referendum, elected a majority of both branches of the Legislature — 33 to 27 in the Assembly and 16 to 5 in the Senate. In addition, the Democratic Assemblymen twelve elected from Essex county bolted the Democratic State platform favoring ratification, and adopted one of their own, emphatically opposing woman suffrage under any circumstances. The suffragists can count on only nineteen out of the sixty votes in the Assembly. This forecast will be ento those precipitate lightening prophets who assumed that the election of a Democratic Governor, pledged to suffrage, ensured favorable action on suffrage in the Legislature.

#### OHIO SUFFRAGISTS LOSE IN THE COURTS

The Ohio suffragists made a desperate attempt to prevent the suffrage question from being submitted to the voters; and to this end, they applied to the courts for an injunction upon Secretary of State Smith to prevent him from submitting the proposed federal amendment to a referendum. But the Franklin county court, before which the application first came, refused it; and the suffragists thereupon taking the case to the Ohio Supreme Court, that tribunal, on the 11th of November, upheld the decision of the lower court.

The woman suffrage amendment could not have been submitted to the voters at the November election in 1919, because the referendum period had not expired between the Legislature's action in ratifying the amendment, and the date of the election. But it can go on the ballot at the election in November of this year; and, as the Ohio voters, so recently as 1917, defeated suffrage on a referendum vote by a majority of more than 146,000, it is possible." The Republican party, safe to predict that the vote this whose platform declared for post- year will put Ohio in the list of

# SUFFRAGE AND ANARCHY

The close connection between the woman suffrage movement and the most extreme form of radicalism was indicated at Boston on the evening of the 18th of December, in Faneuil Hall, when a rally of the National Woman's Party was turned into a "Red" Revival, as the Boston Herald described it. Governor Coolidge had been invited to attend, but he found it convenient to be absent; and Mayor Peters, who had been announced as one of the speakers, did not appear. The band of the Cecil W. Fogg Post of the American Legion had been engaged to play, but refused to keep the contract, when it discovered what the character of the meeting was to be. As the manager of the band explained afterward:

"The withdrawal was in no way a reflection on the question of woman suffrage, but because the Legion stood first for law and order, and proper regard for legally constituted authority, and it was entirely inconsistent for the band to remain at a meeting sponsored by men and women who had served prison sentences and approved of the militant tactics of so-called suffragists which savored of Socialism and Bolshevism."

The temper and character of the meeting were clearly disclosed by the reception given the first speaker, Secretary of State Langtry. Mr. Langtry began by expressing his sympathy with woman suffrage, but went on to make a vigorous denunciation of Bolshevist doctrines. The audience was not in sympathy with him. It jeered, laughed and hissed, and one woman, conspicuous in a front seat, made faces at him. Mr. Langtry said:

"There are twenty-seven Bolshevist organizations in Massachusetts, each with thousands of members, and there are more Bolsheviki in Massachusetts than in any other State in the Union, saving only New York and Illinois. At a recent Sunday meeting in Boston, the orator declared that next Fourth of July will be his Independence Day. 'On that day,' he said, 'we will kill the President of the United States, all

the governors in the country, and all the rich men in the country,' and the audience applauded him vociferously.... It is greatly to be regretted that the Bolsheviki are very strong in our own Back Bay, and among college professors and school teachers, who are secretly teaching the principles of that organization to the students."

The next speaker, Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch, was a good deal more in tune with her Bolshevist listeners. She said:

"Men, this is your world. You've made it what it is, and you ought to be ashamed of it. If you didn't get us into the war, you at least didn't have the gumption to keep us out."

Speaking of having attended a meeting of a local Soviet in southern Germany, Mrs. Blatch elicited warm applause from the audience when she said that she had never before realized "how comfortable and informal a Soviet really is."

The chief speaker of the evening was David Dudley Malone of New York, at one time Collector of that port; repeatedly counsel for the militant picketers; and, as was shown in the recent investigation of Soviet activities in that city, the recipient of a check from Martens, the Soviet "ambassador." He declared that there are two classes of politicians in America, those who really fear that there is going to be a revolution, and those who are just talking about it to make political capital. He affirmed that he did not fear a red or a white or a green menace of any kind, but that, if there is any political, social or economic truth which any people are trying to work out, it is the duty of Americans to listen to it, and, if it is true, to copy its example. He avowed that he was not afraid of Bolshevism, and that he was not interested in a Soviet government for the United States, but that, if the Russian people want it, it is their business to have it. He said, "Do not fear radicalism. Radicalism is getting to the root of the trouble. It is the performing of the major operation, which saves the tissues."

# AVERSE TO THE BAND WAGON

The suffragists will concede that Governor Holcomb of Connecticut has a grim sense of humor; for, in the statement which he made of his reasons for refusing to call a special session of the Legislature to take action on the Federal Suffrage Amendment, he enumerated some of the reasons urged upon him for issuing such a call, and included this:

"A further reason urged was that Woman Suffrage was sure to come by the vote of other states, whatever action this state might take, and that it would be wise to be with the majority or, as it is sometimes expressed, 'get into the band wagon.' It will hardly be claimed that this creates the 'special emergency' mentioned in our Constitution which authorizes the Governor to call a special session."

It is probable that a good many political leaders, in both parties, regret by this time their precipitancy in climbing "into the band wagon."

## BELIEVES IN SOVIETS

Miss Martha Foley, a Boston suffrage-Socialist, when on trial, November 7, on a charge of assaulting a police officer during the rioting in Roxbury at the May-day red flag parade, admitted that she believed in a soviet form of government. She declared that the "present condition of the American Government is despicable," but intimated that the original American Constitution "was good enough as far as it went." Asked whether she had taught the foreigners with whom she had come in contact that the American form of government was originally a good form, she replied "Not exactly"; and, asked further what she would suggest, in view of the fact that she believed the present form of government wrong, she said that she believed in general strikes as a means of changing government, but not necessarily by force, though force often resulted from strikes. All of which is instructive as an illustration of the trend of suffrage-Socialism.